

Claim 149 has been amended to be an independent claim incorporating all limitations of claim 118 to which it had previously ultimately been dependent. Claims 155 and 141 are parallel claims and have been similarly amended. Neither Balakrishnan nor Cole teaches the plurality of sub-classification associated with programmably adjustable thresholds as recited in claims 149, and parallel claims. Balakrishnan teaches a sense circuit constituted of one or more fixed resistors and is responsive to the difference between the forward voltage drop of a LED and a PN junction to produce a relatively temperature independent constant current output (col. 4 line 30 – 49). Neither Balakrishnan nor Cole lend themselves for use with, and do teach the use of, the programmably adjustable thresholds of claims 149, 141 and 155

Support for the amendments may be found in the originally filed specification and claims, and in particular the section before the detailed description associated with Fig. 19A, found beginning on the bottom of page 73. No new matter is added by these amendments.

SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

A telephonic interview was held on May 31, 2007 and agreement was reached that claims 123, 124 and 149, if presented as independent claims, each overcomes the prior art of record. In particular: the predetermined delay of claim 123; the classification of the sum of the current flows of the nodes of claim 124; and the sub-classifications of claim 149 associated with programmably adjustable thresholds are each patentable over the prior art of record. None of these features are taught or suggested by the prior art of record. The examiner requested that the wording of claim 124 be clarified to confirm that the total current flow represents the sum of the current flow. This has been accomplished and expressed herein as the overall current flow.

In particular, regarding claim 123, 144 and 153, the predetermined time period associated with the under-current classification improves performance by allowing for short time periods of under-current activity. Balakrishnan simply detects a current crossing a threshold (col. 4 line 50 – 63) for monitoring and detection purposes with no provision for a particular action or a predetermined period. Balakrishnan takes no action in the event of over-current, and

simply fails to light an LED in the event of an under-current condition (col. 4 line 59 – 63). Removal of power from an under-current load is thus neither suggested nor indicated by Balakrishnan, certainly not removal of power from an under-current load after a predetermined time period.

Regarding claims 124, 133 and 145, neither Cole nor Balakrishnan address the idea of monitoring the total current flow to a plurality of nodes over communication cabling, and classifying the total as one over over-current and normal of claims.

Regarding claim 149, 141 and 155, Balakrishnan teaches a sense circuit constituted of one or more fixed resistors and is responsive to the difference between the forward voltage drop of a LED and a PN junction to produce a relatively temperature independent constant current output (col. 4 line 30 – 49). Balakrishnan does not lend itself for use with, and does teach the use of, the programmably adjustable thresholds of claims 149, 141 and 155.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all pending claims (i.e., claims 123 – 125, 133 - 134, 136 and 141 - 157) is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned agent by telephone if it would in any way aid in the advancement of this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 5, 2007
Reg. No. 48,249

/Simon Kahn/

Simon Kahn
Director of Intellectual Property
PowerDsine, Ltd.

Tel: 1-703-486-1150
Fax: 1-703-892-4510